**Malhar**

**SPEECHES: KEATING AND BANDLER**

**I would do: inclusive language -1st 2 and last 3 paragraphs. Whichever question is first (and I cannot remember), I’d do some context material – like what you have here. Word choice – I’d do the middle bulk of the speech that focuses on the soldier and his attributes. In terms of enduring ideas, you could consider: (1) a peculiarly Australian character – how does Keating establish that idea? Why might that resonate still? (2) Attitude to war: is there (or could it could read as being there?) a subtext about wars? See my idea at the end of my document on Keating. (3) the heroism of the ordinary man. Avoid ‘doubling up’ on quotes-evidence. There is enough to spread them across the 3 responses.**  
  
Word Choice:   
Paul Keating’s speech was delivered on a historically significant and poignant day – on the 75th anniversary of the armistice that ended the Great War in 1918. It’s **no apostrophe here** main purpose was to pay homage and remember the men and women who lost their lives while serving Australia in wars. **[ 1 ]** Keating’s clever choice of words in the speech is effective in uniting the nation while also remembering the sacrifices that so many Australians made for their country in wars at home and abroad.   
Keating begins the speech with a high modality declaration “We do not know....and we never will” to portray a sense of finality. He then uses anaphoric repetition of the phrase “We do not know” which lends emphasis to the fact that the Unknown Soldier is anonymous, and that he represents every Australian. However, his clever listing of what is unknown, “children, family, religion, whether he was married or single, whether he was from the city or the bush, previous occupation” which are the attributes that define a person, has the opposite effect, in that it creates an individuality and identity for the Unknown Soldier.   
His use of statistical data “100,000 Australians who have died in wars...” and emotive language to describe the Great War as a “mad, brutal, awful struggle” reflects his strongly negative attitude towards war. He appeals to the Pathos of the audience through highly emotive words, “horror, and tragedy...inexcusable folly” while also using a powerful verb in “transcends” to highlight a shift towards the positive. He uses contradiction to highlight the paradoxical lesson of “ordinary people....not ordinary” and listing to portray the qualities of endurance, courage, resilience, and self-belief of which the Unknown Soldier is the epitome.   
Symbolism is used by Keating to describe the tomb of the Unknown Soldier as a “reminder of what we have lost” and paradoxically, “of what we have gained”. He uses repetition in “deeper faith” and “deeper understanding” to emphasise the inexorable importance of understanding “what it means to be Australian”. Religious imagery is used in his conclusion “sacrifice of men and women...faith enough for all of us” which sustains the importance of a deeper lesson that transcends the costs of war.   
Thus PJ Keating’s choice of words is effective in portraying the message and satisfying the aim of the speech.

**[ 1 ]** Here I’d try to outline the content of the speech as a way of showing the underlying ideas in it: inclusive language to involve listeners in identity of the soldier, then moving to a focus on him through statistics, possible motives, horrific nature of WW1 to question that (to my mind) is core issue of speech: was it all in vain. Then considers ‘ordinary people’ who are ‘heroes’ and their attributes; this leads into Anzac legend and attributes of soldiers; focus here is clearly on the Unknown Australian Soldier – repeated at start of 3 paragraphs. Speech finishes by returning to inclusive language addressing listeners “What we ..etc” to reconnect audience to soldier and reinforce connection between soldier and present day Australians. I’ve written a lot here and maybe it’s too much. But I think you want to show the speech as unfolding rhetoric, not just a whole bunch of techniques. You identify a lot of techniques, give examples; you also want to show their impact in the speech as a whole. At the end you refer to ‘the message’ and ‘aim’ of the speech. To my mind, you should discuss these more, either at the start, or with your various examples.

Your material is good but I’d aim to link your various examples to the flow or structure of the speech. You may not need that much detail, in any case. 25 marks in 40 minutes = 1.6 minutes per mark = 8 minutes for the 5 mark answers.